



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

few who differ with the author in their thought on the value of money.

The book is too brief to have much value as a work of reference; but it is so well written that it will be frequently turned to for the ideas of a prominent conservative representative of German economic thought. There is an index.

LEWIS H. HANEY.

*University of Texas.*

*La Théorie des Marchés Economiques.* By BERNARD LAVERGNE.  
(Paris: Arthur Rousseau. 1910. Pp. xv, 215. 4 fr.)

M. Lavergne dedicates his monograph to Professor Gide and takes Bourguin's *Mesure de la valeur* as his own point of departure. But he brings to his task a spirit of radical innovation and a belligerent attitude toward what he supposes to be "*l'économie politique classique*" that are all his own. It would be difficult to find some of the doctrines which M. Lavergne attacks (as for example that cost of production is an *exact* measure of value) outside the pages of his own book. It is significant, perhaps, that his accounts of classical theories are, except for a few scattered citations of French translations of Ricardo and Mill, fortified only by references to the *Histoire des doctrines* of Gide and Rist.

The main task which M. Lavergne has set himself, however, is constructive. He submits a complete theory of value and distribution which, though one-sided and burdened with useless terminological innovations, contains much penetrating analysis. He makes much of the fact that he does not invoke competition as a premise, and that his theory is perfectly general. But his achievement here seems to be largely one of terminology, and bad terminology at that. Differential advantage of every sort is called monopoly, and in this way competition is crowded from the field. However, competition is really implicit in much of M. Lavergne's theory (for example, in his use of Jevons' "law of indifference"). The "economic markets" are found to be four in number, embracing respectively finished products, money and credit, productive services, and productive capital. So far as the three first categories are concerned, marginal utility and marginal productivity are held to be the fundamental determinants of value and of income-yielding power. But productive capital (including land, durable and specialized production goods of all sorts, together

with the productive plans or schemes of entrepreneurs) gets an income determined on the principles of rent.

Space does not permit a full exposition of even the salient points of M. Lavergne's system, but two of its features deserve some notice. In the first place, only the net income going to absolutely free capital in the form of loanable funds is called interest. Income arising from the ownership of the concrete, material instruments of production is called rent. The distinction made is closely allied to that emphasized in Marshall's discussion of quasi-rent, although Lavergne does not concern himself with the difference between the long-time and short-time points of view. A second noteworthy point is the treatment of marginal productivity. Diminishing productivity does not appear as an all-pervading principle, determining the proportions in which the factors in production are combined. Instead, labor and free capital (loanable funds, viewed not as a separate factor, but as a necessary instrument in the employment of all the factors in production) are regarded as the active, variable, factors; while land, specialized capital, and the entrepreneur's plans are viewed as the passive, constant, factors. Thus profits appear as a species of differential rent, but otherwise the theory bears little resemblance to Walker's well known ideas on this point.

I am inclined to think that a more thorough acquaintance with what other theorists have done in the past, as well as with what is being done at present, would have made M. Lavergne less arrogant in his general attitude toward these others, and more dubious as to the soundness of all parts of his own constructive work. As it is, the book leaves the impression that the author has cared less whether his theories were sound than whether they were novel. This is especially unfortunate, for there is much evidence that he has theoretical power and tenacity.

ALLYN A. YOUNG.

*Washington University.*

*Le Conflit des Doctrines dans l'Economie Politique Contemporaine.*

By CHARLES BROUILHET. (Paris: Felix Alcan. 1910.  
Pp. viii, 306. 3.50 fr.)

This is not a discussion of value doctrine or of distributive theory, as one might imagine, but a plea for radicalism in politics and in legislation. The author is not a socialist, but a radical—as in some degree all men of good sense have now-a-days to